

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/082,844	02/25/2002	Stephen E. Terry	I-2-0160.2US	8107	
24374	7590 01/11/2006		EXAMINER		
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.			SHAND, ROBERTA A		
DEPT. ICC UNITED PLA	AZA, SUITE 1600	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
30 SOUTH 17	TH STREET	2665			
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No	•	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/082,844		TERRY, STEPHEN	E.			
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Roberta A. Shar	nd	2665				
The MAILING DATE of this co Period for Reply	mmunication appe	ears on the cove	r sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PER WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM 7  - Extensions of time may be available under the properties of the	FHE MAILING DAT rovisions of 37 CFR 1.136 his communication. dimum statutory period will for reply will, by statute, comonths after the mailing d	TE OF THIS CO 6(a). In no event, how Il apply and will expire cause the application	OMMUNICATION rever, may a reply be times SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	l. ety filed the mailing date of this com ) (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) Responsive to communication	ı(s) filed on 20 Oct	tober 2005.						
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .		action is non-fir	ıal.					
3) Since this application is in con	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the	practice under Ex	c parte Quayle,	1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected 7) Claim(s) is/are objected 8) Claim(s) are subject to	is/are withdrawr .ed. d to.	n from conside						
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to	by the Examiner							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on	-		jected to by the F	xaminer.				
Applicant may not request that ar	ny objection to the dr	rawing(s) be held	l in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) in 11) The oath or declaration is obje	_	•			* *			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a a) All b) Some * c) None 1. Certified copies of the p 2. Certified copies of the p 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Inte	e of: priority documents priority documents popies of the priorit pernational Bureau	have been rec have been rec by documents h (PCT Rule 17.2	eived. eived in Application ave been receivee 2(a)).	on No In this National S	itage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Re  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/18/05.5/26/05.	1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P Other:		152)			

Art Unit: 2665

## Double Patenting

- 1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
- 2. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.
- 3. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).
- 4. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of copending Application No. 09/826464.

  Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Applicant broadened claim 11 of parent application 09/826464 producing claim 1 of the present application by eliminating certain elements. Both claims, however claim using a mobile terminal for synchronizing uplink signals in a communication system which supports base station / mobile terminal wireless bi-directional communications via the utilization of a time frame having sequentially identified system time frames, comprising: receiving data from a base station within system time frames including a TA signal which includes TA data and a connection frame number specifying a specific frame for effectuating a timing adjustment; and adjusting the timing

Art Unit: 2665

of uplink transmissions of the mobile terminal in response to the TA data in the received TA signal commencing in the time frame specified in the CFN of the received TA signal.

- Claim 2 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double 5. patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3 of copending Application No. 09/826464. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Applicant broadened claim 3 of parent application 09/826464 producing claim 2 of the present application by eliminating certain elements. Both claims, however are directed to a mobile terminal which supports base station / mobile terminal wireless bi-directional communications via the utilization of a time frame having sequentially identified system time frames, where base stations transmit selectively formatted communication data to mobile terminals within system time frames comprising: a receiver, a transmitter and an associated processor, to receive data from a base station within system time frames including a TA signal which include TA data and a CFN specifying a frame for effectuating a timing adjustment by selected MT; transmitter to transmit selectively formatted communication data to a base station within system time frames synchronized by the processor; and processor to adjust the timing of the transmissions of the processor in response to the TA data in a received signal commencing in the time frame specified in the CFN.
- 6. This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 2665

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 8. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oksala (U.S. 6477151 B1).
- 9. Regarding claim 1, Oksala teaches a method (fig. 4 and col. 4, lines 1-29) of using a mobile terminal for synchronizing uplink signals in a communication system which supports base station (BSS) / mobile terminal (MS) wireless bi-directional communications via the utilization of a time frame having sequentially identified system time frames (timing burst), comprising: receiving data from a base station (BSS) within system time frames (timing frames) including a TA (timing advance index) signal which includes TA (timing advance index) data (col. 4, lines 10-17) and a connection frame number (idle frame slot number) specifying a specific frame for effectuating a timing adjustment (col. 4, lines 18-2); and adjusting the timing of uplink transmissions of the mobile terminal in response to the TA (timing advance index) data in the received TA signal commencing in the time frame specified in the CFN (idle frame slot number) of the received TA (timing advance index)signal (col. 4, lines 23-29).

Art Unit: 2665

10. Regarding claim 2, Oksala teaches (fig. 4 and col. 4, lines 1-29) a mobile terminal (MS) which supports base station (BSS) / mobile terminal (MS) wireless bi-directional communications via the utilization of a time frame (timing burst) having sequentially identified system time frames, where base stations transmit selectively formatted communication data to mobile terminals within system time frames comprising: a receiver, a transmitter and an associated processor; to receive data from a base station (BSS) within system time frames (timing burst) including a TA (timing advance index) signal (col. 4, lines 10-17) which include TA data and a CFN specifying a frame for effectuating a timing adjustment by selected MT (MS); transmitter to transmit selectively formatted communication data to a base station (BSS) within system time frames synchronized by the processor (col. 4, lines 18-22); and processor to adjust the timing of the transmissions of the processor in response to the TA (timing advance index)data in a received signal commencing in the time frame specified in the CFN (idle frame slot number) (col. 4, lines 23-29).

## Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberta A Shand whose telephone number is 571-272-3161. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am-5:30pm.

Art Unit: 2665

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roberta A Shand Examiner Art Unit 2665

PRIMARY EXAMINER